



EXHIBIT B

From: **matthew finston** matthew.finston@yahoo.com 
Subject: MMJ.TODAY
Date: May 10, 2015 at 9:59 AM
To: Christoffersent@gmail.com

MF

In regards to your latest article,

This is a request to remove my name and any reference to my name from your website MMJ.TODAY that you claim association with. You and your website have made false statements about me. You have falsely called me a criminal and a fraud. I have not been convicted of any crime nor have committed any crime. A website that you have stated partial ownership of has claimed otherwise. The statements were made with complete disregard of the truth. and had you asked seeking alpha whether or not my statements violated any disclosure rules you would have found that they have not.



This is "defamation per se."

Defamation Per Se

Slander per se consists of any one of the following:

Statement charging an individual with a serious crime; Liberman v. Gelstein, 80 N.Y.2d 429, 435 (1992).

Libel per se consists of

"[a]ny written or printed article . . . if it tends to expose the plaintiff to public contempt, ridicule, aversion or disgrace, or induce an evil opinion of him in the minds of right-thinking persons, and to deprive him of their friendly intercourse in society." Rinaldi v. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 42 N.Y.2d 369, 379 (1977)

In your article, you claim that my statements are evidence of criminal stock bashing. Not only did I confirm with Seeking Alpha that I have committed no wrong doing, another shareholder went ahead and first asked the SEC whether or not I have broken any laws.

". Each and every one of Finston's articles published false information with the intent to damage and devalue the Company's stock price."

I emailed the managing editor at seeking alpha the following:

"I never shorted FITX but I did state publicly that it would have been nice if I could. Have I violated any of Seeking Alpha's disclosure rules? I didn't think it was wrong to state a desire to make money as it was clear the stock would inevitably lose in value.

Tuesday, October 07, 2014 8:35:09 PM 42438 Post # of 175204

I am the same Matt Finston that said "I want to short FITX." I called my brokerage and tried shorting it at .067, well before I wrote that most recent article on the company. Sadly, my brokerage said that to

short just 4,000 shares, I had to put up \$10,000 for the margin. 4,000 shares? You mean lock-up \$10,000 just to short \$268, where my maximum profit would be \$268? Yeah, I would love to short FITX. Just not worth locking up \$10,000.

Now If I could have shorted \$10,000 worth of FITX at .067, that would've been nice. I could have taken home \$3800 in profit. But \$101.84? I'll pass.

Any ideas on how to short this without the crazy margin requirements? Looking at interactive brokers. any others?

I don't understand why shareholders are making such a big deal about it. Perhaps they are unable to separate wanting to profit from a stock's change in value versus holding a grudge against the company?"

Seeking alpha responded with the following:

No. That exceeds any requirement we have. You had no position and said so. I'd like to go long 10,000 shares of Apple, but I don't have the capital to do so. Saying that's my goal indicates my bullishness on the company though, which is more valuable to readers.

In sum, you're good.

Thanks,

GBM

George B. Moriarty

Managing Editor, Opinion & Analysis

Seeking Alpha"

MMJ.TODAY has committed libel with the following. This is 100% false.

". Each and every one of Finston's articles published false information with the intent to damage and devalue the Company's stock price."----

You claim the following "

"Matt Finston has engaged in obvious and admitted fraudulent conduct and willful misrepresentations with the intent to manipulate the price of FITX and cause a loss of value to shareholder's stock – as sellers or purchasers. His fraudulent conduct satisfies all of the elements (identified above) necessary to constitute a Rule 10b-5 violation. "

This is what the SEC wrote in response to a shareholder with a similar concern:

RE: Recent complaint by one Matthew Finston regarding CEN Biotech

Paggi, Terry A. (PaggiT@SEC.GOV)

Add to contacts

5/05/15

[Keep this message at the top of your inbox]

PaggiT@SEC.GOV

Opinions provided on internet blogs falls under the First Amendment of Free Speech. Where the line can be crossed is when someone uses a media to their benefit in securities trading. An example would be if someone held many shares of a stock and spread a rumor online that would cause others to buy the stock and drive the price up and the person would then sell the stock at the inflated price.

Also, Mr. Finston posting email communication that I sent him is not a violation of any laws. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

[cid:image001.jpg@01CB7CFD.95FF0780](#)

Terry A. Paggi, CFE, CAMS
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
Division of Enforcement
Chicago Regional Office
175 W. Jackson Blvd.
Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60604
Tel: 312.353.1050
*E-mail: paggi@sec.gov

" Unbelievably, although we will not show the name and contact information for this SEC agent, Finston actually published the name and personal contact info of this agent as well as showing screen shots of the actual emails. Conduct that certainly violates SEC internal procedure. "

and as the SEC states:


"Mr. Finston posting email communication that I sent him is not a violation of any laws. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me."

And this laughable but also defamatory statement:

The article has also altered numerous statements that complete change the meaning. According to **Masson v. New Yorker Magazine, Inc.** falsely attributing a statement is defamatory.

The article states: "On yet another occasion Finston states the following about FITX, "I'll bash them all on fb, twtr, I'll write their names on the doors of _____ if I have to. F—k these guys".'

No. It wasn't. It was quoting the following <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vRq8IMXoAxE>



I have publicly clarified this quote numerous yet it continues to be misquoted in order to ruin my character. This demonstrates gross negligence of the truth and malicious intent.

The article has caused enough damage that Brady Farrell posted the following statement:



Anyone who has read this article has now come to associate me with criminal activity.



This is a request to please cease and desist publishing defamatory statements about my person. As you have stated publicly that MMJ.TODAY was your website, or at least you have shared ownership, that tells me you are taking responsibility for the statements that have been published. This is the last time I will send an email to you, Taylor Christoffersen, directly. The next time you will hear from me will be through an attorney. And the address on file is 1356 155Th, Olathe, KS 66062.

From: matthew finston matthew.finston@yahoo.com
Subject: For your information
Date: May 25, 2015 at 3:32 AM
To: Editor@mmj.today
Cc: samcary777@gmail.com

MF

The following has been posted on your website since May 10th. A similar email was sent to samcary777@gmail.com.

This is not a 'final warning' because you have already received that. This is for your records as well as to let you know that I will be filing a lawsuit.

This is a request to remove my name and any reference to my name from your website MMJ.TODAY. You and your website have made false statements about me. You have falsely called me a criminal and a fraud. I have not been convicted of any crime nor have committed any crime. The statements were made with complete disregard of the truth. and had you asked seeking alpha whether or not my statements violated any disclosure rules you would have found that they have not.

This is "defamation per se."

Defamation Per Se

Slander per se consists of any one of the following:

Statement charging an individual with a serious crime; *Lieberman v. Gelstein*, 80 N.Y.2d 429, 435 (1992).

Libel per se consists of

"[a]ny written or printed article . . . if it tends to expose the plaintiff to public contempt, ridicule, aversion or disgrace, or induce an evil opinion of him in the minds of right-thinking persons, and to deprive him of their friendly intercourse in society." *Rinaldi v. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.*, 42 N.Y.2d 369, 379 (1977)

In your article, you claim that my statements are evidence of criminal stock bashing. Not only did I confirm with Seeking Alpha that I have committed no wrong doing, another shareholder went ahead and first asked the SEC whether or not I have broken any laws.

MMJ.TODAY States:

". Each and every one of Finston's articles published false information with the intent to damage and devalue the Company's stock price."

I emailed the managing editor at seeking alpha the following:

"I never shorted FITX but I did state publicly that it would have been nice if I could. Have I violated any of Seeking Alpha's disclosure rules? I didn't think it was wrong to state a desire to make money as it was clear the stock would inevitably lose in value.

Tuesday, October 07, 2014 8:35:09 PM 42438 Post # of 175204

I am the same Matt Finston that said "I want to short FITX." I called my brokerage and tried shorting it at .067, well before I wrote that most recent article on the company. Sadly, my brokerage said that to short just 4,000 shares, I had to put up \$10,000 for the margin. 4,000 shares? You mean lock-up \$10,000 just to short \$268, where my maximum profit would be \$268? Yeah, I would love to short FITX. Just not worth locking up \$10,000.

Now If I could have shorted \$10,000 worth of FITX at .067, that would've been nice. I could have taken home \$3800 in profit. But \$101.84? I'll pass.

Any ideas on how to short this without the crazy margin requirements? Looking at interactive brokers. any others?

I don't understand why shareholders are making such a big deal about it. Perhaps they are unable to separate wanting to profit from a stock's change in value versus holding a grudge against the company?"

Seeking alpha responded with the following:

No. That exceeds any requirement we have. You had no position and said so. I'd like to go long 10,000 shares of Apple, but I don't have the capital to do so. Saying that's my goal indicates my bullishness on the

company though, which is more valuable to readers.

In sum, you're good.

Thanks,

GBM

George B. Moriarty

Managing Editor, Opinion & Analysis

Seeking Alpha"

This demonstrates that MMJ.TODAY has grossly erred by stating the following 100% false statement:

". Each and every one of Finston's articles published false information with the intent to damage and devalue the Company's stock price."----

The article further falsely claims the following:

"Matt Finston has engaged in obvious and admitted fraudulent conduct and willful misrepresentations with the intent to manipulate the price of FITX and cause a loss of value to shareholder's stock – as sellers or purchasers. His fraudulent conduct satisfies all of the elements (identified above) necessary to constitute a Rule 10b-5 violation. "

This is what the SEC wrote in response to a shareholder with a similar concern:

RE: Recent complaint by one Matthew Finston regarding CEN Biotech

Paggi, Terry A. (PaggiT@SEC.GOV)

Add to contacts

5/05/15

[Keep this message at the top of your inbox]

PaggiT@SEC.GOV

Opinions provided on internet blogs falls under the First Amendment of Free Speech. Where the line can be crossed is when someone uses a media to their benefit in securities trading. An example would be if someone held many shares of a stock and spread a rumor online that would cause others to buy the stock and drive the price up and the person would then sell the stock at the inflated price.

Also, Mr. Finston posting email communication that I sent him is not a violation of any laws. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

[cid:image001.jpg@01CB7CFD.95FF0780](#)

Terry A. Paggi, CFE, CAMS

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

Division of Enforcement

Chicago Regional Office

175 W. Jackson Blvd.

Suite 900

Chicago, IL 60604

Tel: 312.353.1050

*E-mail: paggi@sec.gov

" Unbelievably, although we will not show the name and contact information for this SEC agent, Finston actually published the name and personal contact info of this agent as well as showing screen shots of the actual emails. Conduct that certainly violates SEC internal procedure. "

and as the SEC states:

"Mr. Finston posting email communication that I sent him is not a violation of any laws. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me."

And this laughable but also defamatory statement:

The article has also altered numerous statements that complete change the meaning. According to Masson v. New Yorker Magazine, Inc. falsely attributing a statement is defamatory.

The article states: "On yet another occasion Finston states the following about FITX, "I'll bash them all on fb, twtr, I'll write their names on the doors of if I have to. F—k these guys".'

No. It wasn't. It was quoting the following film <https://www.youtube.com/watch?>

The statement was directed at Chris Parry, Wolf of Weed St, and Matt Finston. It was a quote. And you have skewed the interpretation of it even though I have made clear on numerous occasions that you have grossly misconstrued the statements.

Even though I have publicly clarified this quote numerous yet it continues to be misquoted in order to ruin my character. This demonstrates gross negligence of the truth and malicious intent.

The article has caused enough damage that Brady Farrell posted that my name and

"Criminal is trending #2 on Bing!"

Anyone who has read this article has now come to associate me with criminal activity.

You have falsely and maliciously called me a fraud. You have made numerous false statement that have caused irreparable damage. These false statements were made with gross neglect of the truth in hopes of destroying me, my name, and my future. They have brought harm to my family and has impinged on our ability to make a living.

I have proven with clear and indisputable evidence that your article makes numerous false claims of facts and I will seek damages. The longer this is up, the greater the damage.

I see no other resolution to this other than legal action.



Matt Finston · NYU Gallatin School of Individualized Study

This is a request to remove my name and any reference to my name from your website MMJ.TODAY. You and your website have made false statements about me. You have falsely called me a criminal and a fraud. I have not been convicted of any crime nor have committed any crime. The statements were made with complete disregard of the truth. and had you asked seeking alpha whether or not my statements violated any disclosure rules you would have found that they have not.

This is "defamation per se."

Defamation Per Se

Slander per se consists of any one of the following:

Statement charging an individual with a serious crime; *Lieberman v. Gelstein*, 80 N.Y.2d 429, 435 (1992).

Libel per se consists of

"[a]ny written or printed article . . . if it tends to expose the plaintiff to public contempt, ridicule, aversion or disgrace, or induce an evil opinion of him in the minds of right-thinking persons, and to deprive him of their friendly intercourse in society." *Rinaldi v. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.*, 42 N.Y.2d 369, 379 (1977)

In your article, you claim that my statements are evidence of criminal stock bashing. Not only did I confirm with Seeking Alpha that I have committed no wrong doing, another shareholder went ahead and first asked the SEC whether or not I have broken any laws.

MMJ.TODAY States:

"Each and every one of Finston's articles published false information with the intent to damage and devalue the Company's stock price."

I emailed the managing editor at seeking alpha the following:

"I never shorted FITX but I did state publicly that it would have been nice if I could. Have I violated any of Seeking Alpha's disclosure rules? I didn't think it was wrong to state a desire to make money as it was clear the stock would inevitably lose in value.

Tuesday, October 07, 2014 8:35:09 PM 42438 Post # of 175204

I am the same Matt Finston that said "I want to short FITX." I called my brokerage and tried shorting it at .067, well before I wrote that most recent article on the company. Sadly, my brokerage said that to short just 4,000 shares, I had to put up \$10,000 for the margin. 4,000 shares? You mean lock-up \$10,000 just to short \$268, where my maximum profit would be \$268? Yeah, I would love to short FITX. Just not worth locking up \$10,000.

Now If I could have shorted \$10,000 worth of FITX at .067, that would've been nice. I could have taken home \$3800 in profit. But \$101.84? I'll pass.

Any ideas on how to short this without the crazy margin requirements? Looking at interactive brokers. any others?

I don't understand why shareholders are making such a big deal about it. Perhaps they are unable to separate wanting to profit from a stock's change in value versus holding a grudge against the company?"

Seeking alpha responded with the following:

No. That exceeds any requirement we have. You had no position and said so. I'd like to go long

10,000 shares of Apple, but I don't have the capital to do so. Saying that's my goal indicates my bullishness on the company though, which is more valuable to readers.

In sum, you're good.

Thanks,

GBM

George B. Moriarty

Managing Editor, Opinion & Analysis

Seeking Alpha"

This demonstrates that MMJ.TODAY has grossly erred by stating the following 100% false statement:

". Each and every one of Finston's articles published false information with the intent to damage and devalue the Company's stock price."-----

The article further falsely claims the following:

"Matt Finston has engaged in obvious and admitted fraudulent conduct and willful misrepresentations with the intent to manipulate the price of FITX and cause a loss of value to shareholder's stock - as sellers or purchasers. His fraudulent conduct satisfies all of the elements (identified above) necessary to constitute a Rule 10b-5 violation. "

This is what the SEC wrote in response to a shareholder with a similar concern:

RE: Recent complaint by one Matthew Finston regarding CEN Biotech

Paggi, Terry A. (PaggiT@SEC.GOV)

Add to contacts

5/05/15

[Keep this message at the top of your inbox]

PaggiT@SEC.GOV

Opinions provided on internet blogs falls under the First Amendment of Free Speech. Where the line can be crossed is when someone uses a media to their benefit in securities trading. An example would be if someone held many shares of a stock and spread a rumor online that would cause others to buy the stock and drive the price up and the person would then sell the stock at the inflated price.

Also, Mr. Finston posting email communication that I sent him is not a violation of any laws. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

cid:image001.jpg@01CB7CFD.95FF0780

Terry A. Paggi, CFE, CAMS

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

Division of Enforcement

Chicago Regional Office

175 W. Jackson Blvd.

Suite 900

Chicago, IL 60604

'Tel: 312.353.1050

*E-mail: paggit@sec.gov

" Unbelievably, although we will not show the name and contact information for this SEC agent, Finston actually published the name and personal contact info of this agent as well as showing screen shots of the actual emails. Conduct that certainly violates SEC internal procedure. "

and as the SEC states:

"Mr. Finston posting email communication that I sent him is not a violation of any laws. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me."

And this laughable but also defamatory statement:

The article has also altered numerous statements that complete change the meaning. According to Masson v. New Yorker Magazine, Inc. falsely attributing a statement is defamatory.

The article states: "On yet another occasion Finston states the following about FITX, "I'll bash them all on fb, twtr, I'll write their names on the doors of _____ if I have to. F—k these guys".'

No. It wasn't. It was quoting the following film <https://www.youtube.com/watch?>
The statement was directed at Chris Parry, Wolf of Weed St, and Matt Finston. It was a quote. And you have skewed the interpretation of it even though I have made clear on numerous occasions that you have grossly misconstrued the statements.

Even though I have publicly clarified this quote numerous yet it continues to be misquoted in order to ruin my character. This demonstrates gross negligence of the truth and malicious intent.

The article has caused enough damage that Brady Farrell posted that my name and

"Criminal is trending #2 on Bing!"

Anyone who has read this article has now come to associate me with criminal activity.

You have falsely and maliciously called me a fraud. You have made numerous false statement that have caused irreparable damage. These false statements were made with gross neglect of the truth in hopes of destroying me, my name, and my future. They have brought harm to my family and has impinged on our ability to make a living.

I have proven with clear and indisputable evidence that your article makes numerous false claims of facts and I will seek damages. The longer this is up, the greater the damage.

I see no other resolution to this other than legal action.

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 10 at 10:16am

○




Matt Finston · NYU Gallatin School of Individualized Study

so you didn't see this^^^^^???

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#) · May 17 at 7:33am

•



Chris Warner · Northern Illinois University

And personally I appreciate people like Finston for shedding light and DD on corrupt companies!

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 10 at 8:01am



Heyam C. Farrell · HFCC

Finston can't take a taste of his own Medicine !!
Karma is a Bitch isn't it Finston !!!!

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · 1 · [Follow Post](#) · May 9 at 10:40pm



Brian Kaufmann

Let's hope the shareholders voices will finally be heard!

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · 1 · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 9:16pm



Brady Farrell · Top Commenter · Phoenix, Arizona

Matt Finston and criminal is trending #2 on Bing!!

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · 1 · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 11:29pm



Robert Young · [Follow](#) · Works at Retired and having a ball.

Look at him run for the bathroom to CHANGE HIS UNDERWEAR

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · 1 · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 8:05pm



Genghis Hill · Everything at Everywhere

This is good info. DoorMatt is done.

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 8:51pm



Ericstevenc Sven Cantares · [Follow](#) · Works at Self-Employed

Tawdry escepadas sorry

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 10:05pm



Ericstevenc Sven Cantares · [Follow](#) · Works at Self-Employed

Never does it again.....


[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 9:19pm



Joey Strickland · Wingate University

Someone is in trouble.

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [1](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 7:57pm




Susan Barbee · Top Commenter · Owner at Self-Employed

Paulo Pincaro ,You seem to be at least somewhat objective. And I appreciate that.!

I have to ask you, Is this really your view on what has gone on with Cen Biotech? you made this comment.

"To me, it's pretty obvious that instead of actually seeking real answers for why the FITX grounds were never brought up to code in order to be re inspected and licensed, a bunch of naive investors have essentially started looking for the boogeyman. But guess what? Even if Matt is indicted (wouldn't it be considered libel to suggest that when you have no evidence of such an outcome forthcoming???), you still have to ask why months after the initial inspection, Bill didn't simply bring the building to code to satisfy the requirements as outlined in HC's initial evaluation. You still have no answers as to why during the last three months you ... [See More](#)

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [Follow Post](#) · Edited · May 11 at 10:55am



Susan Barbee · Top Commenter · Owner at Self-Employed

From The FAQ .

WHY WAS THE PRE-LICENSE INSPECTION REPORT MADE PUBLIC?

A known shareholder to the company did a Freedom of Information Act request, and received from the Privacy Commissioner under the Authority from Health Canada, the full inspection report. So as to not allow this shareholder sensitive inside information, CEN Biotech, Inc. immediately released the inspection report per their legal obligations to the SEC.

The press release states clearly: "As CEN Biotech Inc. continues in its effort to be transparent, it releases its Health Canada Pre-License inspection report." The report can be viewed [HERE](#). – The press release can be found [HERE](#).

To address your concern around our inspection report being released; that report was never provided to us after inspection by Health Canada. A shareholder filed a Freedom of Informa... [See More](#)

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · May 11 at 10:59am



James Smiley

I guess the bashers dumped 9,000,000 shares in the final hour and caused the pps to decrease 11%. Maybe not, insiders are making a nice profit on recently unrestricted shares.

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 14 at 9:45pm



Paulo Pincaro · [Follow](#) · Top Commenter · Stock Broker at First Colonial Group

Few problems.

1: you have failed to prove anything he said was false
2: if there was an actual valid claim to be made, why would FITX not take any actual legal steps
3: people short and make their opinions all the time, just ask Bill Ackman... If we're at a point of completely disregarding first amendment rights, I think we've hit rock bottom. But as I said, there are many prominent cases of people shorting and making it public. The Soros pound short also comes to mind. There is nothing fraudulent about that any more than saying you're going long a stock and posting a positive opinion or fact.

To me, it's pretty obvious that instead of actually seeking real answers for why the FITX grounds were never brought up to code in order to be re inspected and licensed, a bunch of naive investors have essentially started looking for th... [See More](#)


[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 9:28pm



Paulo Pincaro · [Follow](#) · Top Commenter · Stock Broker at First Colonial Group

Ok I stand corrected there is a doc against the minister of health...

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · 1 · May 8 at 9:34pm



Susan Barbee · Top Commenter · Owner at Self-Employed

<http://finance.yahoo.com/news/creative-edge-nutrition-inc-zoning-172646503.html>

The Building was absolutely "up to Code" ZOning and the preinspection.

we would like to release the fact that Health Canada, as a result of their pre-license inspection on July 31, 2014 did state they were satisfied with our facility and were, in their words, "...the applicant (CEN BioTech Inc.) will be ready and able to meet the requirements of the MMPR provided the deficiencies addressed during the inspection debrief meeting were addressed...". We are happy to report to our shareholders that those deficiencies were immediately addressed and ask for your continued patience as Health Canada assesses that information given the tremendous workload they currently have with the vast array of applicants currently before them.

Nice to see you jump on board to Alan.!

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · 1 · May 8 at 10:09pm

○




Paulo Pincaro · [Follow](#) · Top Commenter · Stock Broker at First Colonial Group

That's one way not to disprove anything I said. And for the record, I think Alan is an idiot (see: growlife). Stop being naive, start accepting the con job. If you were building a company in Canada, would you use the little excess capital you have to buy an apartment in Manhattan? If you cared for your shareholders, would you make up a story about having purchase orders from GNC and only PR that it fell through after it got blown up on twitter? This is not a company worth trusting, period. I think it's hilarious people are still even discussing it and haven't moved on. You say claims were false but can't point to a single one. What does that tell you?

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · May 9 at 6:35am

[View 2 more](#)


•



Joe Pannu · Top Commenter · UC Davis

Its a investment... i dont think any person made money on these stocks other then people that were permoting lemons. Im not saying all companies are bad but 99.9% otc is pump and dump IMHO. IF you loss money in otc (OF THE COUNTER) PLEASE dont blame anyone but yourself.

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 10 at 6:41pm



• **Chris Warner** · Northern Illinois University

FITX is still moving? I thought it was dead. What do thy have going for it now that Health Canada shot it down? Sorry but it looks like all the "bashers" were right about this bs company!

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 10 at 7:59am



• **Brady Farrell** · Top Commenter · Phoenix, Arizona

Fantastic way to illustrate the potential criminal behavior by this punk. I warned him a long time ago as did many others, this is the big leagues not a classroom. Oh and Alan please go p*ss on the CEN property so you will be arrested for trespassing.

[Reply](#) · [Like](#) · [Follow Post](#) · May 8 at 10:52pm